| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/717,707 | 11/21/2003 | Noriko Minamino | 05225.0253 | 8855 |

22852      7590      01/08/2007

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2166 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 01/08/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2"><strong>Office Action Summary</strong></td><td>Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td>10/717,707</td><td>MINAMINO ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Srirama Channavajjala</td><td>2166</td></tr>
</table>

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 October 2006</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**    2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All    b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

2.      Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 10/18/2006.

3.      Claims 1,3-5,7,14,21-22 have been amended [10/18/2006]


## *Priority*

4.      Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on

Application Sl.No_2002-340041_ filed on **22 November 2002** under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d),

the certified copy has been filed in the Application No. 10/717707, filed on 11/21//2003.


## *Double Patenting*

5.      In view of applicant's filed "_terminal disclaimer_" approved on 11/2/2006, the

double patent rejection as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.


## *35 USC § 101*

6.      In view of applicant's amendment to the claims 1,3-5,7,14,21-22, the rejection

under 35 35 USC § 101 as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn,


## *Information Disclosure Statement*

7.      The information disclosure statement filed on 10/18/2006 is in compliance with

the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy is enclosed with

this Office Action.

8.      The information disclosure statement filed on 08/12/2004 is in compliance with

the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy was enclosed with

previous Office Action mailed on 7/18/2006.

9.      The information disclosure statement filed on 11/21/2003 is in compliance with

the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy was enclosed with

previous Office Action.


## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.     The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a
> foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year
> prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**11.     Claims 1-22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by**

**Lowry, US Patent No. 5953724, published on Sept 14,1999.**

12.     As to claim 1, 21-22, Lowry teaches a system which including 'an apparatus for

displaying a hierarchical structure [fig 2A, col 4, line 48-54], displaying a hierarchical

structure corresponds to Lowry's fig 2A;

        a memory configured to hierarchically store a database [fig 1, element 26], for a

plurality of classes having a property, the property of one class in the plurality of classes

being inherited to a child class belong to the one class [fig 2A, col 4, line 57-67, col 5,

line 2-12, 46-48, col 14, line 61-62, col 15, line 11-17, line 50-57, fig 5A]; Lowry is

directed to database structure, more specifically arranging nodes in a hierarchical

structure having parent-child, relationship as detailed in fig 2A, hierarchical structure

corresponds to Lowry's fig 2A; it is further noted that Lowry specifically teaches "node

properties table" that including information about each node in the hierarchical

relationship as detailed in table 4, therefore, node property whether parent node or child

node is integral part of Lowery's teaching., further each node may be an object belongs

to specific class[es], because, Lowry suggests chart is built using basic "graphic

objects" [col 14, line 61-62], standard objects provided with languages such as Visual

C++, Visual Basic and like [see col 14, line 63-64], therefore, inheritance is the concept

that when a class of object is defined, any subclass that is defined can inherit the

definitions of one or more classes, hence, property of one class in the plurality of

classes being inherited to a child class belong to the one class corresponds to Lowry's

fig 5A;

a display configured to output at least part of a 'first area of the one class and at

least part of a second area of the child class belonging to the one class, the first area

including the second area' [col 5, line 66-67, col 6, line 39-43, col 7, line 19-28, co 10,

line 15-31], Lowry specifically teaches multiple related hierarchical structure in which

specific nodes establishes relationship between other nodes as parent-child

relationship, further each node regarded as specific parent class and specific child class

as detailed in col 6, line 39-43, col 7, line 19-28, , col 10, line 15-31], it is noted that

Lowry specifically suggests each class or category of entity are defined in a hierarchical

structure for example organizations, people, locations as detailed in col 10, line 15-22.

'an operation unit configured to select the first area or the second area on said

display' [[fig 7A, col 12, line 10-14], Lowry specifically teaches number of fields

displayed in a specific area[s], for example code may be displayed in a code box

element 148 corresponds to first area, while association selection box corresponds to

second area on the display, this allows users to select first area i.e., code or association

selection box element 146;

'wherein, when said operation unit selects the second area, said display outputs

a list of properties of the child class, the list including the property of the one class ' [col

15, line 62-67, col 16, line 1-6], Lowry specifically suggests node properties with respect

to key fields in the chart level, also node properties including height of the box, vertical

gap, width of the box and like as detailed in col 16, line 1-6.


13.     As to claim 2, Lowry disclosed 'display outputs all of the first area including all of

the second area' [fig 2A-2B].


14.     As to claim 3, Lowry disclosed 'display outputs class information related to the

one class or the at least one child class or the child in response to a selection from said

operation unit' [col 4, line 61-63]..

15.     As to claim 4, Lowry disclosed 'display outputs a list of properties of the one

class when said operation unit selects the first area [col 6, table 1, line 38-41], table 1

specifically suggests list of different class properties including property type, functions.


16.     As to the claim 5, Lowry disclosed 'display outputs property information related

to one property in the list of properties when said operation unit selects the one

property from the list of properties' [table 1-2, col 9, line 28-36].


17.     As to claim 6, Lowry disclosed 'display outputs a mark in correspondence with

each class of the first area and the second area, and wherein the mark represents that

a corresponding class hierarchically includes a child class' [fig 2A-2B, col 9, line 41-48].


18.     As to claim 7, Lowry disclosed 'an operation unit configured to indicate whether

an area of the child class is displayed in an area of the corresponding class' [fig 2A-2B]..


19.     As to claim 8, Lowry disclosed 'a status of the mark of the corresponding class

of which the area of the child class is displayed is different from a status of the mark of

the corresponding class of which the area of the child class is not displayed' [fig 2A-2B,

col 9, line 49-58].

20.    As to claim 9, Lowry disclosed 'a status of the mark of the corresponding class

of which the child class has an instance is different from a status of the mark of the

corresponding class of which the child class does not have an instance' [fig 5A, 2A,

col 7, line 48-58].


21.    As to claim 10, Lowry disclosed 'display outputs another mark in corresponding

with the child class which has the instance' [col 8, line 28-33].


22.    As to claim 11, Lowry disclosed 'operation unit selects a class to display direct

classes from the plurality of classes, and wherein said display outputs the direct classes

to which the class belongs' [col 8, line 38-45].


23.    As to claim 12, Lowry disclosed operation unit sets a universal root class

commonly including a first hierarchical structure derived from a first root class and a

second hierarchical structure derived from a second root class' [fig 2A-2B], Lowry

specifically suggests hierarchical structure and hierarchical relationships as detailed in

fig 2A-2B..


24.    As to claims 13-14, Lowry disclosed 'operation unit sets a retrieval start point to

the one class of the first area on said display, and wherein a retrieval object is limited to

the child class having the instance' [col 9, line 15-21, fig 2A-2B].

25.     As to claim 15, Lowry disclosed 'the child class inherits at least one property of

each of a plurality of parent classes in the plurality of classes stored in said memory'

[table 1-2, col 9, line 28-36].

26.     As to claim 16-17, Lowry disclosed 'a display status of the child class inheriting

at least one property of each of the plurality of parent classes is different from a display

status of another child class not inheriting at least one property of each of the plurality of

parent classes' [col 15, line 42-53].

27.     As to claim 18, Lowry disclosed 'a color of a property in the list of properties of

the child class as an inheritance destination class is the same as a color of the parent

class having the property as the inheritance source class' [col 15, line 66-67, col 16,

line 1-6]..

28.     As to claim 19, Lowry disclosed 'operation unit sets a number of hierarchical

levels for a plurality of classes at an initialization mode to display the hierarchical

structure of the plurality of classes'[fig 2A-2B]..

29.     As to claim 20, Lowry disclosed 'operation unit sets an identifier of each class to

be expansible displayed in the plurality of classes at the initialization mode' [col 9, line

15-21].

### Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/18/2006 with respect to claims 1-22 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiners' response see the discussion below:

a) At page 13, claims 1, applicant argues that Lowry for example, fails to teach the claimed "plurality of classes each having a property, the property of one class in the plurality of classes being inherited to a child class".

As to the argument [a], as best understood by the examiner, Lowry is directed to database structure, more specifically arranging nodes in a hierarchical structure having parent-child, relationship as detailed in fig 2A, hierarchical structure corresponds to Lowry's fig 2A; it is further noted that Lowry specifically teaches "node properties table" that including information about each node in the hierarchical relationship as detailed in table 4, therefore, node property whether parent node or child node is integral part of Lowery's teaching., further each node may be an object belongs to specific class[es], because, Lowry suggests chart is built using basic "graphic objects" [col 14, line 61-62], standard objects provided with languages such as Visual C++, Visual Basic and like [see col 14, line 63-64], therefore, inheritance is the concept that when a class of object is defined, any subclass that is defined can inherit the definitions of one or more classes, hence, property of one class in the plurality of classes being inherited to a child class belong to the one class corresponds to Lowry's fig 5A;

b)      At page 14, claim 1, applicant argues that Lowry is silent as to displaying a list of

properties for a "child class" that includes a property of "one class"

As to the argument [b], as best understood by the examiner, Lowry specifically

suggests node properties with respect to key fields in the chart level, also node

properties including height of the box, vertical gap, width of the box and like as detailed

in col 16, line 1-6, it is also noted that "table-1" provides each "node" on a menu

associated with specific actions for example as detailed in table –1, therefore, graphical

interface allows to display list of nodes and their associated properties particularly, list of

node names available from the menu list selection, each node level or fields associated

with respective code as detailed in fig 7, col 12, line 8-14.


Examiner applies above arguments to depend claims 2-20.



*Conclusion*



**The prior art made of record**

a.      US Patent No.                    5953724

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
*Patent Examiner.*
December 11, 2006.   SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
                     PRIMARY EXAMINER